Message

From: Joerger, Verena [joerger.verena@epa.gov]

Sent: 12/6/2017 3:24:26 PM

To: Long, Kia [Long.Kia@epa.gov]; Chow, Alice [chow.alice@epa.gov]

CC: Hyden, Loretta [Hyden.Loretta@epa.gov]

Subject: RE: MDE EE Concurrence Letter

Attachments: 2016EECombinedDecisionLetterMDEv2.docx

Hi,

I have revised the letter and created a table as an attachment. Let me know what you think.

Kia, I wasn't sure what else to use beside "monitor days". "Monitor days" is what is used in the EE guidance and templates. I think we need a term that describes the specific day and monitor that the exceedance occurred at. This will make a whole lot more sense when we have to process PA's EE demo since they requested exclusion of data from all monitors for three days, despite the lack of exceedances on many of the days at many of the monitors.

Verena Joerger

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 3 Air Protection Division Office of Air Monitoring and Analysis 1650 Arch Street, Philadelphia, PA 19103 (215) 814-2218

From: Long, Kia

Sent: Wednesday, December 06, 2017 9:00 AM

To: Chow, Alice <chow.alice@epa.gov>; Joerger, Verena <joerger.verena@epa.gov>

Cc: Hyden, Loretta < Hyden.Loretta@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: MDE EE Concurrence Letter

I agree. For clarity, I think providing a table would be the best approach. The term "monitor days" in the sentence "the EPA concurs on 17 monitor days, defers action on 16 monitor days, and non-concurs on 10 monitor days, based on the weight of evidence ..." is a little confusing and could misinterpreted to mean taking action on #days instead of #monitors for EE duration.

Is there another way we can word it?

From: Chow, Alice

Sent: Wednesday, December 06, 2017 8:36 AM

To: Joerger, Verena < joerger.verena@epa.gov>; Long, Kia < Long.Kia@epa.gov>

Cc: Hyden, Loretta < Hyden.Loretta@epa.gov > Subject: RE: MDE EE Concurrence Letter

I would simplify the letter to have the lists of concur, defer, nonconcur monitors at an attachment with the references to them in the letter. Perhaps a table would be sufficient. If Lori has additional ozone data, that should also be in the attachment.

Alice

Alice H. Chow
Associate Director (3AP40)
Office of Air Monitoring and Analysis
USEPA, Region 3
1650 Arch Street
Philadelphia, PA 19063

Phone: 215-814-2144 Email: chow.alice@epa.gov

From: Joerger, Verena

Sent: Wednesday, December 06, 2017 7:17 AM

To: Long, Kia <Long.Kia@epa.gov>; Chow, Alice <chow.alice@epa.gov>

Cc: Hyden, Loretta < Hyden. Loretta@epa.gov>

Subject: MDE EE Concurrence Letter

Good Morning,

I have written a concurrence letter that combines our decisions for both EEs. I have not sent this to Megan yet to be formatted, as I wanted to give you all a chance to read through it and make any changes you feel necessary.

Let me know what you think. I am thinking that we should still have two, separate TSDs, so I will also work on finalizing those today to share with you.

Best,

Verena Joerger

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 3 Air Protection Division Office of Air Monitoring and Analysis 1650 Arch Street, Philadelphia, PA 19103 (215) 814-2218